

and the remaining member represented the Office of General Services, which was one of the largest departments of the Secretariat in terms of the number of staff members employed. The selection had been made for the purpose of ensuring that adequate account would be taken of the interests of the staff and of the financial implications of the Fund's activities and that there would be adequate representation of one of the largest departments in the Organization; it had not been made on the basis of geographical considerations.

87. He would be the first to agree that, in terms of the totality of the representation on the Pension Board, there

was an overwhelming preponderance of individuals from certain regions of the world. Nevertheless, that was the result of the manner of selection or election prescribed by the Regulations and Rules of the Fund as they stood currently and as they had been established by the General Assembly itself. As long as those Regulations and Rules remained in their current form, it would not be possible to predict the geographical composition of the Board from year to year.

*The meeting rose at 11.40 p.m.*

## 1774th meeting

Wednesday, 17 December 1975, at 10.50 a.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1774

### STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF ALGERIA

1. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria), speaking on a point of order, drew the attention of the Committee to an interview which the President of the General Assembly had given to representatives of the press, in which he had stated that the General Assembly had exhausted its agenda and there remained only some financial reports of the Fifth Committee which would have no effect on the Assembly's work. Such lack of understanding of the workings of the General Assembly demonstrated by so senior a person would do nothing to help to maintain cohesion among the Main Committees.

2. The CHAIRMAN assured the Committee that he had not been associated in any way with the statement by the President of the Assembly. He had received a message from the latter indicating that he (the President) was fully aware of the importance of the final plenary meeting of the General Assembly, dealing with the work of the Fifth Committee, and that he would make that clear at the end of the plenary meeting currently in progress.

### AGENDA ITEM 95

**Programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)**

*Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (A/C.5/L.1291)*

3. Mr. ABOUL GHEIT (Egypt), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report on agenda item 95 (A/C.5/L.1291), reminded the Committee that it had decided not to reflect the debate on the item in its report.

4. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of the draft report.

*Part A was adopted by 69 votes to 10.*

*Part B was adopted by 80 votes to none.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 70 votes to 10.*

### AGENDA ITEM 96

**Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 and medium-term plan for the period 1976-1979 (concluded)**

*Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (A/C.5/L.1290 and Add.1)*

5. Mr. ABOUL GHEIT (Egypt), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report, recalled that the Committee had agreed at an early stage that its debate on item 96 should not be reflected in its report. Part I (A/C.5/L.1290) of the draft report contained the draft resolutions and decisions already adopted by the Committee in connexion with the programme budget, and part II (A/C.5/L.1290/Add.1) contained a summary of the first and second readings of the budget estimates and the draft resolutions relating to the programme budget. Some estimates were not indicated, but the appropriate figures would be inserted before the report was submitted to the General Assembly.

6. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the preceding meeting the representative of Yugoslavia had proposed the inclusion in the report on section 6 of the programme budget, concerning ECE, of a paragraph, similar to the formulation adopted by the Committee with regard to sections 7 and 8 of the programme budget, authorizing the Secretary-General, if need be, to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session a request for supplementary appropriations.

7. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation would have serious difficulties in accepting that

proposal, because ECE had a higher rate of real growth of expenditure than any other regional commission. The Committee had included such a paragraph—paragraph 14 of document A/C.5/L.1290—in the case of ESCAP as a compromise measure, because some delegations had felt that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had been less generous in its recommendations under section 7 than under other sections of the budget. If the Yugoslav proposal was accepted, his delegation would have to propose similar action in respect of all the regional commissions, and that would be counterproductive at the current stage.

8. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) pointed out that an exception had been made in the case of ESCAP because of the particular circumstances regarding the recruitment factor, as was clearly spelt out in paragraph 14 of the draft report. Unless the representative of Yugoslavia could give a reason for his proposal, New Zealand would have difficulty in supporting it.

9. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that there seemed to be a fundamental misunderstanding concerning the nature of the decision in paragraph 14. It was the understanding of his delegation that, when the delayed recruitment factor was applied to appropriations, the intention was not to force the Secretary-General to live within those appropriations, for if that was the case he would be instructed not to recruit for certain posts. In fact, the Secretary-General was expected to make efforts to recruit persons for the authorized posts throughout the two-year period, and the delayed recruitment factor simply took account of the fact that, since he was unlikely to be immediately successful, not all the money would be needed. The decision concerning ESCAP had therefore been superfluous, and so was the Yugoslav proposal, because the purpose behind it would be achieved in any event.

10. Mr. BRANKOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) reminded representatives of the implications of the implementation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975. In that connexion, a heavy burden would be placed on ECE, which would require support, possibly including financial support. His delegation's proposal concerning section 6 should therefore be adopted.

11. Mr. STOTTEMYER (United States of America) said he agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the Yugoslav proposal was superfluous. It was his understanding that, if additional funds were required, the Secretary-General could always request them from the General Assembly; the Advisory Committee would review his request and report to the Fifth Committee. He asked the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management to state whether that was the case.

12. Mr. GEORGESCU (Romania) said that his delegation was prepared to support the draft decision proposed by Yugoslavia.

13. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that he agreed with the representative of Yugoslavia. If, however, what the representative of the United Kingdom had said was correct, he wondered whether it might not be possible, instead of

incorporating in the Committee's report the decision proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia, to include a statement to the effect that it was the Committee's understanding that the Secretary-General would proceed along the lines proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia.

14. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that such a statement would be valid for all sections of the budget, and he questioned whether it should be included under section 6 alone.

15. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, if during the biennium the Secretary-General found that he was unable to keep within the budget approved by the General Assembly for a given section, and if he could not absorb potential over-expenditures elsewhere in the budget by requesting transfers of funds, he could come back to the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly with a request for supplementary appropriations.

16. With regard to the effect of reductions proposed by the Fifth Committee and approved by the General Assembly on the administration of the budget appropriations for a particular section, he said the Advisory Committee could recommend that certain posts requested by the Secretary-General should not be included in the budget, and deductions would then be made, in respect of those posts, from the funds requested by the Secretary-General. When posts were actually eliminated from the budget, the Secretary-General could not recruit individuals to fill them. Alternatively, the Advisory Committee could approve the inclusion of posts in the manning table while estimating that the Secretary-General would be unlikely during the biennium to fill the posts for the entire two-year period and that he would not therefore require all the funds requested to finance the posts for the whole period. In the latter instance the Advisory Committee applied a delayed recruitment factor, whereby the posts were retained in the estimates and in the budget, and the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to proceed to fill them, but some of the funds, representing the delayed recruitment factor, were deducted from the appropriation on the ground that the Secretary-General would be unlikely to require all the funds for the biennium. Despite the deduction of that amount, the Secretary-General was free to recruit for all the posts approved in the budget. Thus, in the case of the manning table for ECE, the Secretary-General could proceed to recruit for the posts approved by the General Assembly and would be free, without specific instructions from the Assembly, to request supplementary funds should a shortfall occur.

17. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that, if the Yugoslav proposal was put to the vote, his delegation would vote against it. As the explanation given by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had demonstrated, the proposal was entirely superfluous.

18. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation would also vote against the Yugoslav proposal. The Committee was currently reviewing decisions already adopted, and it was not the time to introduce new proposals. If, however, the proposed decision was to be

included under section 6, he would insist that it should also apply to all the other regional commissions, and indeed that it should be incorporated in the report for all sections of the budget. It was not reasonable to include the decision in the case of a regional commission that had already received its due.

19. Mr. SETHI (India) said that he would vote in favour of the Yugoslav proposal. At best, it would leave the Secretary-General an option which could be exercised on the understanding that any recommendation he might make must be approved by the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee. At worst, even if the proposal was superfluous, it was realistic to include it under section 6. Although there was merit in the argument of the representative of the Upper Volta, he hoped that the latter would not press for the inclusion of the decision under every section of the budget.

20. Mr. LELLIKI (Sweden) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the inclusion of the decision proposed by the Yugoslav delegation. Every effort should be made to ensure that ECE would have the necessary resources to discharge the new responsibilities entrusted to it at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

21. Mr. DJEKILAMBERT (Chad) said that his delegation would vote against the Yugoslav proposal. The international community had set itself a course and should not lightly depart from it. If the Committee decided that the Secretary-General should be given some freedom of action in the matter, he should have the same freedom with respect to all sections of the budget.

22. Mr. HAHN (Canada) said that, although Canada was a member of ECE, his delegation would have to abstain on the Yugoslav proposal, which presented difficulties of principle for it.

23. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that, while his delegation was somewhat sympathetic towards the Yugoslav proposal, it would have to abstain if it was put to the vote, in view of the stage which had been reached in the Committee's work.

24. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) said that he failed to see why so much importance was being attached to the issue. He assumed that the Yugoslav representative wished to ensure that ECE, which would be meeting in Yugoslavia in 1976, should receive increased support. That was no reason for reviewing the budgets of all the regional commissions. He urged the representative of Yugoslavia to withdraw his proposal and to raise the matter in 1976 so that the Secretariat could consider how it might accommodate his delegation.

25. Mr. STOTTLEMYER (United States of America) said his delegation could not agree that in any instance the Fifth Committee should explicitly call on the Secretary-General

to submit supplementary estimates. First, the Secretary-General had the authority to do so if necessary and, secondly, it would be inappropriate at the closing stage of the Committee's work to add a paragraph along the lines proposed by Yugoslavia under section 6 or anywhere else in the report, since the Committee had already taken logical decisions on the programme budget proposals. His delegation could not, therefore, support the Yugoslav proposal.

26. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that he had just consulted with the representative of Yugoslavia, who had authorized him to state that, in the circumstances, his delegation would not press for a decision on the matter it had raised, on the understanding that it would be possible to raise the matter again if need be at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

27. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that the Committee had no objection to that procedure.

*It was so decided.*

28. Mr. STOTTLEMYER (United States of America) expressed dissatisfaction at the fact that, owing to lack of time, the Committee had not had the opportunity to give the draft report the careful attention it deserved.

*Part I (A/C.5/L.1290) of the draft report was adopted without objection.*

29. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolutions contained in part II (A/C.5/L.1290/Add.1) of its draft report.

*Draft resolution I A was adopted by 83 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution I B was adopted without objection.*

*Draft resolution I C was adopted by 84 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted by 83 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 85 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution III was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

#### COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

*After an exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work for the thirtieth session.*

*The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.*